

<b>Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary</b>	Contr I N .	Patent Under Reexamination	
	09/772,427	LAWRENCE, DAVID	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Richard Fults	3628	

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):

(1) Richard Fults (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mitchell Feller (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 05 September 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ patent owner 2) ☐ patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  
Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23.


Identification of prior art discussed: yes.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  
See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN **ONE MONTH** FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: On 9/5/2002 a telephone interview between the examiner and Mitchell Feller, attorney, was conducted in which the examiner pointed out that there was prior art on the identification of a person with political activities, but not on actions taken using that information in a financial transaction. It was suggested that the independent claims should be amended to focus on that action being taken, in a summary fashion, and that several claims concentrating on those actions should be included in claim 1 and the other independent claims. The attorney said he would consult with his client and make the changes if he agreed. The suggested changes were subsequently made and forwarded to the examiner for entry on 9/11/2002.